UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,553	03/23/2004	Michael C. Matti	343355-600075	2556

81261   7590   06/23/2010
Patent Group 2N
Jones Day
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

EXAMINER
PARKER, BRANDON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/23/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>16 February 2010</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) <u>1-7,9-17,19 and 43-54</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-7, 9-17, 19 and 43-54</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

2/16/2010 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9, 17, 19, 44-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sakaguchi et al (US Patent 6720982 Hereinafter "Sakaguchi") in view

of Hayton et al (US 20020105548 hereinafter Hayton).

Regarding claim 1, Sakaguchi discloses a system for displaying content of a web page

to a user (Col. 1 lines 15-23, Col. 3 lines 4-7, 207, Fig. 4) on

comprising:

one or more processors (1, Fig. 1)

one or more computer-readable storage mediums containing instructions operable

to cause the one or more processors to perform operations including (1, 4, 14, Fig. 1,

Col. 4 lines 10-27): generating a wrapper web page (120, Fig. 1 and Fig. 2)

generating wrapper web page instructions, which when executed, embed target web

page content and a protection component into the wrapper web page "Sakaguchi

provides a transparent window starting HTML 400 is loaded into the web browser 207,

and a transparent window 110 is generated (step 305), the transparent window control

unit 209, in which a code of JavaScript operates, invokes a program of the C language

through a Java class, and asks the operating system 203 to initiate the process of the

transparent window main body 219 wherein the javascript/HTML embedded content (i.e.

onload, Fig. 8) and a transparent window is in front of the application (i.e. HTML

content/web browser), (Col. 2 lines 4-12, Col. 6 lines 5-42, Fig. 1, Fig. 2). It is apparent

the Javascript is embedded web page, therefore the web page serves as the wrapper

page and the embedded webpage is the Javascript content not seen by the user (i.e.

transparent to the user).

executing the wrapper web page instructions to display the embedded target web

content but does not explicitly disclose a target web page and the first protection

component overlaying a first region on the target web page "web browser 207 accesses

a web server via a network, and obtains various information including JavaScript. In the

preferred embodiment of the present invention, the web browser 207 is the application

for which the operator performs an operation on the display screen, but the idea of the

present invention is not limited to this, and an application other than the browser may be the target application of misoperation prevention", (Col. 5 lines 29-37)where the target application is the wrapper page and the content is the target content.

receiving data indicative of an attempted interaction with the first region on the target content, wherein the attempted interaction is prevented by the first protection component "transparent window control HTML 410 is built in the head of a program related to the button for enabling the mouse input blocking control", (Col. 6 lines 28-35).

Hayton discloses a button type disables a button based on a property value associated with a property is path. An iframe type displays an embedded frame, where the contents of the frame are constructed from a page described by the value of property path. The iframe is a web page within a webpage therefore the frame is the wrapper page in an embedded frame which is the target web page (Par. 0020, Par. 0031).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the hidden iframe as taught by Hayton with the transparent/application mouse disabling function of Sakaguchi to effectively preview a webpage without modifying the web page or web page code.

Claims 53 and 54 are similar in scope to claim 1 therefore the claims are rejected under similar rationale

Regarding claim 2, Sakaguchi discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the first protection component shields the target web page from interaction with an interface pointing device or a keyboard device "discards all the received mouse events, the

mouse input can be blocked when the transparent window 110 is displayed on the
foremost part", (Col. 6 lines 43-58), "a transparent window main body 219 appears in
front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser of the target application to
block the operator's input (i.e. preventing user interaction), (Col. 5 lines 50-60, Col.2
lines 4-12) to "prevent buttons (i.e. an element/element(s) from a webpage) other than a
predetermined button from being pushed until the process executed by pushing it
terminates" (Col. 1 lines 31-33)

Regarding claim 3, Sakaguchi discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the first
protection component acts as a shield in preventing user interaction with a plurality of
elements displayed on the target web page "a transparent window main body 219
appears in front (i.e. overlay) of the application window/web browser of the target
application to block the operator's input (i.e. preventing user interaction), (Col. 5 lines
50-60, Col.2 lines 4-12) to "prevent buttons (i.e. an element/element(s) from a webpage)
other than a predetermined button from being pushed until the process executed by
pushing it terminates" (Col. 1 lines 31-33)

Regarding claim 4, Sakaguchi discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the first region
on the target
web page displays content including an interactive element, and wherein the interactive
element is a hyperlink (Fig. 7 discloses the hyperlinks which can not be accessed)

Regarding claim 5, Sakaguchi discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the first region

on the target

web page displays content including an interactive element, and wherein the interactive

element is a control that can be manipulated ("button for enabling the mouse input

blocking control", Col. 6 lines 28-35).

Regarding claim 6, Sakaguchi discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the first region

on the target web page displays content including an interactive element, and wherein

the interactive element is a web page form control element (Col. 6 lines 11-18).

Regarding claim 7, Sakaguchi discloses the system of claim 6, Sakaguchi discloses an

element of a webpage may be blocked from selection by disabling the mouse function

but does not disclose the element being a combo box Hayton discloses wherein the

web page form control element is a combo box and wherein the first protection

component renders the combo box inoperable (Par. 0144, Par. 0222)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine

the input box as taught by Hayton with the transparent/application pages of Sakaguchi

to effectively disable input controls without modifying the content of the webpages.

8. (Cancelled).

Regarding claim 9, Sakaguchi discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the first

protection component as a transparent element placed directly in front of the first region

on the target web page (110, Fig. 1)

13. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 1, Sakaguchi discloses wherein when interaction with the first region on the target web page is attempted the overlaid first protection component displays a notification indicating that interface access is being prevented ((Col. 6 lines 54-58)

14. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 1, wherein when interaction with the first region on the target web page is attempted a visibility characteristic of the overlaid first protection component is changed Hayton discloses a button type disables a button based on a property value associated with a property is path. An iframe type displays an embedded frame, where the contents of the frame are constructed from a page described by the value of property path. The iframe is a web page within a webpage therefore the frame is the wrapper page in an embedded frame which is the target web page.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the hidden iframe as taught by Hayton with the transparent/application mouse disabling function of Sakaguchi to effectively preview a webpage without modifying the web page or web page code.

17. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 1, Sakaguchi discloses wherein the target

web page is displayed for display upon a computing device (Fig. 3, Fig. 4)

19. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 17, wherein the ~ web page content is

displayed for display upon a personal digital assistant (PDA) device (Fig. 3)

44. (New) The system of claim 1, wherein a second protection component overlays a

second region on the target web page (Abstract, Fig. 3-5)

45. (New) The system of claim 1, wherein a plurality of protection components overlay a

plurality of corresponding regions on the target web page (Abstract, Fig. 3-5)

46. (New) The system of claim 1, wherein attempted interactions can be prevented

according to interaction type Hayton discloses a button type disables a button based on

a property value associated with a property is path. An iframe type displays an

embedded frame, where the contents of the frame are constructed from a page

described by the value of property path. The iframe is a web page within a webpage

therefore the frame is the wrapper page in an embedded frame which is the target web

page (Par. 0020, Par. 0031).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to

combine the hidden iframe as taught by Hayton with the transparent/application mouse

disabling function of Sakaguchi to effectively preview a webpage without modifying the
web page or web page code.

47. (New) The system of claim 1, wherein multiple attempted interactions cause the
overlaid first protection component to become more visible, Hayton discloses a button
type disables a button based on a property value associated with a property is path. An
iframe type displays an embedded frame, where the contents of the frame are
constructed from a page described by the value of property path. The iframe is a web
page within a webpage therefore the frame is the wrapper page in an embedded frame
which is the target web page (Par. 0020, Par. 0031).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to
combine the hidden iframe as taught by Hayton with the transparent/application mouse
disabling function of Sakaguchi to effectively preview a webpage without modifying the
web page or web page code.

48. (New) The system of claim 1, wherein multiple attempted interactions cause an
audio message or signal to be generated (Abstract).

49. (New) The system of claim 1, wherein the target web page is accessed from a target

web site, and wherein multiple attempted interactions cause one or more regions of the
target website to become prohibited.

Hayton discloses a button type disables a button based on a property value associated
with a property is path. An iframe type displays an embedded frame, where the contents
of the frame are constructed from a page described by the value of property path. The
iframe is a web page within a webpage therefore the frame is the wrapper page in an
embedded frame which is the target web page (Par. 0020, Par. 0031).

   It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to
combine the hidden iframe as taught by Hayton with the transparent/application mouse
disabling function of Sakaguchi to effectively preview a webpage without modifying the
web page or web page code.

50. (New) The system of claim 1, wherein the wrapper web page is transparent Hayton
discloses a button type disables a button based on a property value associated with a
property is path. An iframe type displays an embedded frame, where the contents of the
frame are constructed from a page described by the value of property path. The iframe
is a web page within a webpage therefore the frame is the wrapper page in an
embedded frame which is the target web page (Par. 0020, Par. 0031).

   It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to
combine the hidden iframe as taught by Hayton with the transparent/application mouse

disabling function of Sakaguchi to effectively preview a webpage without modifying the

web page or web page code.

51. (New) The system of claim 1, wherein the wrapper web page is visible

Hayton discloses a button type disables a button based on a property value associated

with a property is path. An iframe type displays an embedded frame, where the contents

of the frame are constructed from a page described by the value of property path. The

iframe is a web page within a webpage therefore the frame is the wrapper page in an

embedded frame which is the target web page (Par. 0020, Par. 0031).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to

combine the hidden iframe as taught by Hayton with the transparent/application mouse

disabling function of Sakaguchi to effectively preview a webpage without modifying the

web page or web page code.

52. (New) The system of claim 1, wherein the wrapper web page displays an alert

indicating that the attempted interaction has been prevented.

Hayton discloses a button type disables a button based on a property value associated

with a property is path. An iframe type displays an embedded frame, where the contents

of the frame are constructed from a page described by the value of property path. The

iframe is a web page within a webpage therefore the frame is the wrapper page in an embedded frame which is the target web page (Par. 0020, Par. 0031).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the hidden iframe as taught by Hayton with the transparent/application mouse disabling function of Sakaguchi to effectively preview a webpage without modifying the web page or web page code.

Claims 10 11 12 15 16 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakaguchi et al (US Patent 6720982 Hereinafter "Sakaguchi") in view of Hayton et al (US 20020105548 hereinafter Hayton) in view of Sponheim et al (US Patent 6639610 hereinafter Sponheim)

Regarding claim 10 Sakaguchi discloses the system of claim 9, Hayton discloses a button type disables a button based on a property value associated with a property is path. An iframe type displays an embedded frame, where the contents of the frame are constructed from a page described by the value of property path. The iframe is a web page within a webpage therefore the frame is the wrapper page in an embedded frame which is the target web page (Par. 0020, Par. 0031).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the hidden iframe as taught by Hayton with the transparent/application mouse

disabling function of Sakaguchi to effectively preview a webpage without modifying the web page or web page code.

Sponheim discloses wherein the size of the transparent element is variable (Col. 79 and 80 lines 25-29)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine variable size iframe of Sponheim and the hidden iframe as taught by Hayton with the transparent display of Sakaguchi.

11. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 1, Sponheim discloses wherein the first protection component includes a gap for manipulation of a navigation region associated with the target web page (Col. 79 and 80 lines 25-29)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine variable size iframe of Sponheim and the hidden iframe as taught by Hayton with the transparent display of Sakaguchi.

12. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 11, Sponheim discloses wherein the navigation region includes a scroll-up and scroll-down navigation section associated with the target webpage (Col. 79 and 80 lines 25-29)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine variable size iframe of Sponheim and the hidden iframe as taught by Hayton with the transparent display of Sakaguchi.

15. (Currently Amended) The system of claim [[1]] 14, Sponheim discloses wherein the visibility characteristic change includes changing a color of changes such that the overlaid first protection component (Col. 79 and 80 lines 25-29)

16. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 1, Sponheim wherein the target web page is to-be displayed of a web browser (Col. 79 and 80 lines 25-29)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine variable size iframe of Sponheim and the hidden iframe as taught by Hayton with the transparent display of Sakaguchi.

43. (New) The system of claim 1, Sponheim wherein the size of the first protection component varies in accordance with the size of the first region (Col. 79 and 80 lines 25-29)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine variable size iframe of Sponheim and the hidden iframe as taught by Hayton with the transparent display of Sakaguchi.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON PARKER whose telephone number is (571)270-1302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 730- 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on 571-272-7767. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DENNIS-DOON CHOW/   Brandon Parker
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174   Examiner
                                                        Art Unit 2174

.